

Arkansas Department of Education
Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan
As Amended April 2003
Amended April 18, 2003
Amended May 16, 2003

Critical Element	SEA Response
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>The foundation of the Arkansas plan is based in the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing Assessment and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) as adopted by the State Board of Education and referenced in Arkansas Statute. This plan requires that every school participate in the State assessment system and thus includes all schools. The reader may refer to this document in its entirety via the State Education Agency (SEA) Web site. http://arkedu.state.ar.us/actaap/index.htm</p> <p>State Supported Schools</p> <p>Arkansas has three State-supported schools that receive no local funds. These schools include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arkansas School for the Blind (K-12) 2. Arkansas School for the Deaf (K-12) 3. Arkansas School for Mathematics and Sciences (11-12) <p>The Arkansas School for the Blind and Arkansas School for the Deaf are residential special purpose schools serving students from across the state who have these disabilities. Some students attending have multiple disabilities. All, 100%, of these students participate in the state assessment system. A small percentage take the Benchmark tests with no accommodations, most take the regular assessments with accommodations, and all others complete the alternate portfolio assessments. Scores for these schools are reported publicly as are other schools. Both of these school have in the past and will continue to participate fully in the State Accountability system, the scores will be included in the report card and AYP for these schools will be determined in the same manner as any other school. However, since these schools serve a special population, are residential schools serving students from throughout the state, and are established by state statute some sanctions may not apply.</p> <p>The Arkansas School for Mathematics and Sciences (ASMS) is a residential school serving students based on application and demonstrated academic proficiency, especially in mathematics and science. This school only serves students who are juniors and seniors. All but a very small percentage of these students have completed the Algebra I and geometry end-of-course tests at their home school prior to selection to ASMS. All students attending ASMS participate in the state end-of-course assessment in literacy. Student scores are reported individually and as a school. In the very unlikely event that an ASMS student has not taken the Algebra I or geometry end-of-course test with scores reported at their home school, they are required to complete those tests and the scores are reported by ASMS.</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>Charter Schools</p> <p>As of the 2002-2003 school year, Arkansas has four (4) Open Enrollment¹ Charter Schools. State statutes and rules and regulations governing these schools require them to fully participate in ACTAAP.</p> <p>Schools for which there is no Tested Grade(s)</p> <p>In Arkansas, schools are configured in a multiplicity of ways – there are 57 different grade-level combinations. Among these are a small number of schools such as a single-grade kindergarten center and schools having some combination of kindergarten through Grade 2. The SEA proposes to document from the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) a pairing of schools that do not include a tested grade in such a way that each is linked to one or more schools having a tested grade. In these cases when the school with a tested grade fails to meet the accountability requirements, then the “feeder” school(s) will also be required to meet the same sanction/reward status as the school having the tested grade(s).</p> <p>In the case(s) of an LEA that may have a divided high school – Grades 9-10 on one campus and Grades 11-12 on another campus – those schools will be paired and considered as one unit.</p> <p>Juvenile Detention Institutions</p> <p>The Division of Youth Services, which is an agency under the Department of Human Services, operates juvenile detention institutions. This agency is not operated by the SEA nor does the SEA have any oversight for programming provided for individuals who are sentenced there for long-term offenses or for those who are incarcerated for a short term sentence. Further, those entities are not defined as a school. Individuals of school age who would be assigned to one of these institutions by the court system are not counted as enrolled in any school or district. Individual units from the SEA provide consultative service to these entities, but those students are not engaged in an instructional setting that is part of the State’s K-12 school system nor are they assessed by the State’s assessment system.</p> <p>Should a student be enrolled in a local school district on or before October 1 of any school year then become incarcerated for a period of time during the year and return to the local school, that student would be required to take the appropriate assessment, but that student’s scores would be included with the state-level reporting, not reporting at the LEA level.</p> <p>Dialogue is underway to explore ways to assure any instruction provided to residents of the juvenile detention system is based on state content standards and that short-term students are prepared to take the state assessments should they be returned to the local district prior to the onset of testing for that year.</p>

¹ Open Enrollment Charter Schools generally serve students from more than one local school district. They are approved by the State Board of Education based on an application and review process.

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>Legislation was introduced and adopted in the 2003 session of the Arkansas General Assembly bring ACTAAP (the State's accountability system) it into full compliance with NCLB and the AYP provisions. The legislation becomes law on July 1, 2003. Subsequent rules and regulations are under consideration by the State's Administrative Procedures Act and should be fully adopted by August 15, 2003.</p>
<p>1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?</p>	<p>All public schools and LEAs are subject to the same performance system. The SEA makes no distinction between schools based on grade level, size of school, poverty status or other disaggregating factor. The local schools and LEAs all administer the same statewide assessments under the ACTAAP system and the results from those examinations comprise the data from which AYP decisions are made.</p> <p>In previous years Arkansas has operated under a dual system of rewards and sanctions – one driven by federal programs (Title I specifically) and another based on statutes referred to as Academic Distress. Under ACTAAP and NCLB, the SEA and State Board of Education have adopted policy that assures only one system will be used to determine the performance of LEAs and determine AYP for each school and its sub-populations.</p> <p>All AYP calculations are made through the Office of Research Management and Evaluation (ORME) at the University of Arkansas. ORME receives the data directly from the scoring company and works with SEA staff to validate the data and “clean” it for processing. It is ORME's responsibility to apply the AYP formula to the combined population and to each subgroup thus providing a report to each school, district and the SEA. SEA staff reviews the reports prior to distribution to schools and publicly reporting the data.</p>
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of basic, proficient and advanced student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics</p>	<p>ACTAAP identifies four (4) proficiency levels. These levels are identified as below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced. This document provides working definitions of these proficiency levels for Grades 4 and 8 for the content areas of mathematics and reading/language arts. Revisions to the ACTAAP document will contain the newly developed performance levels for Grade 6 and the end-of-course tests. These definitions and the background documentation will be available for the peer-review panel.</p> <p>As additional tests are developed these proficiency levels will be developed for those tests and validated through the technical review committee and the standards setting process.</p>
<p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?</p>	<p>The SEA is committed to reporting test scores, information on AYP, and other accountability reporting in a timely manner that will meet the requirements of NCLB. The SEA vendor contract for the scoring and reporting of data provides for a 90-day turnaround. The SEA has already begun dialogue with the contractors, the Technical Advisory Committee² and the Office of Research, Measurement and Evaluation (ORME) to respond in a timely manner to scoring and reporting of data from the assessment system.</p>

² The Technical Advisory Committee is composed of nationally recognized testing experts, psychometricians, and state testing directors. They advise the SEA concerning policy issues related to the assessment system.

Critical Element	SEA Response																		
	<p>The SEA anticipates the appointment of a Curriculum Review Committee to be impaneled during the spring 2003. This committee will advise on content, alignment and other coverage issues related to the assessment system.</p> <p>The SEA policy provides for administration of the tests that comprise the assessment system in April of each year. It is currently under consideration to administer the writing part of the assessment as early as February. This earlier administration date would allow the hand scoring to begin early and be complete in time to merge student scores with the other test responses that are machine scored. Documentation on these revisions will be available for review by the peer review committee and for implementation with the 2003-2004 administration.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Timeline for Delivery of AYP Information to Schools and Parents Based on 2002-2003 data for 2003-2004 School Year</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="586 804 1463 1245"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th><th>Action</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>May 1</td><td>All completed test materials delivered to contractor for scoring. Current contract provides for a 90-day turn around for scoring.</td></tr> <tr> <td>August 1</td><td>Delivery of results to SEA</td></tr> <tr> <td>August 4</td><td>Transmittal of results to ORME for processing and calculation of AYP</td></tr> <tr> <td>August 8</td><td>Electronic transmission of data to schools</td></tr> <tr> <td>August 15</td><td>Deadline for schools to notify parents of students entitled for choice and/or supplemental services for the 2003-2004 school year</td></tr> <tr> <td>August 20</td><td>School starts</td></tr> <tr> <td>August 22- Sept 5</td><td>Parents exercise choice options</td></tr> <tr> <td>September 1</td><td>Parents exercise supplemental service options</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Date	Action	May 1	All completed test materials delivered to contractor for scoring. Current contract provides for a 90-day turn around for scoring.	August 1	Delivery of results to SEA	August 4	Transmittal of results to ORME for processing and calculation of AYP	August 8	Electronic transmission of data to schools	August 15	Deadline for schools to notify parents of students entitled for choice and/or supplemental services for the 2003-2004 school year	August 20	School starts	August 22- Sept 5	Parents exercise choice options	September 1	Parents exercise supplemental service options
Date	Action																		
May 1	All completed test materials delivered to contractor for scoring. Current contract provides for a 90-day turn around for scoring.																		
August 1	Delivery of results to SEA																		
August 4	Transmittal of results to ORME for processing and calculation of AYP																		
August 8	Electronic transmission of data to schools																		
August 15	Deadline for schools to notify parents of students entitled for choice and/or supplemental services for the 2003-2004 school year																		
August 20	School starts																		
August 22- Sept 5	Parents exercise choice options																		
September 1	Parents exercise supplemental service options																		
1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?	<p>The SEA produces an annual report card. The report found on the SEA Web site at http://www.as-is.org contains all required data elements described in Appendix A of the Workbook except for reporting by subpopulations. The SEA has revised the reporting format to include these required elements and will be displayed beginning with the 2002-2003 school year data. A proposed revision template is presented as an attachment. This template includes each of the required subgroups and the structure for reporting across the spectrum of content and years.</p> <p>The scheduled date for release of report card information has been revised to conform to the requirements of NCLB legislation and guidance. Current SEA policy does not require publishing the report card information prior to the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>By State statute, Arkansas is an English-only state and as such all instruction and reporting information is in English. The SEA will work with LEAs to make available translators on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Graduation rates are reported consistent with the definition as applied by</p>																		

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>the National Center for Educational Statistics. Those data currently are not disaggregated by sub-groups but will be included in proposed revisions. The reviewer is referred to the template format for revision of reporting.</p>
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?</p>	<p>SEA policy as adopted by the State Board of Education provides for the establishment of one system of rewards and sanctions. ACTAAP describes rewards and sanctions based on the assessment system and “other” academic indicators. This system does not meet all the guidelines for NCLB and thus will be modified to be in compliance.</p> <p>The proposed system is consistent with the requirements of NCLB. With the adoption of Act 1467 of 2003 by the Arkansas General Assembly, Arkansas’ accountability system is fully aligned with the requirements of NCLB. Subsequently, State Board of Education must revise rules and regulations regarding Academic Distress and the model that is used to set those sanctions as well as the process for removing schools so placed.</p> <p>Also, for the 2001-2002 school year, the SEA developed a model that provided rewards to schools for a combination of absolute performance and improvement as compared to “like” schools. The Committee of Practitioners is strongly committed to maintaining such a model as a way of encouraging lower performing schools that make greater than expected gains. The SEA policy advisors and the State Board are aware of the need for some revision of the model that recognizes high performance schools and governs rewards, but believes there is merit in the model that compares a school with other schools having like demographic characteristics. Funds, in addition to those that may be available from NCLB, are available from which the SEA makes incentive awards to local schools.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rewards</p> <p>Rewards will be based on a system structured to recognize schools that demonstrate and maintain high performance over time and to recognize schools that demonstrate growth on both the state-mandated indicators. Rewards also can be used to highlight individual schools so that their practices can be adapted in other schools and districts across the state.</p> <p>Trend goals will be established for cohorts of students using cross-sectional data from the same indicator (e.g. Primary Benchmark Exam). Statistical techniques will be developed, by averaging multiple years of data, to minimize the inherent volatility associated with the natural variation in performance of these different groups. This means that if a school is continuing to improve, the trend will be a consistent indicator that fewer students are below proficient, with the effect of “off-year” or “good-year” performance minimized.</p> <p>Improvement goals will be established for the <u>same</u> cohort of students using a longitudinal database. As students progress from grade to grade, data will be maintained and constantly updated.</p> <p>Each year the ADE will recognize individual schools that demonstrate exceptional performance in two categories:</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response		
	<p><u>Performance Awards</u> - Absolute levels of student achievement and other indicators.</p> <p><u>Growth Trend and Improvement Awards</u> – Recognized growth trends and improvement in student achievement and other indicators.</p> <p>All award categories, which could include cash payments to individual schools, will be implemented as the indicator performance levels are established through the standard setting process.</p> <p>The focus of any cash awards must be to enhance the capability of the school to better serve its students. Awarded funds shall be used to expand programs, provide additional materials and supplies, support technology, provide bonuses to staff, or make possible other enhancements that serve the needs of the school or children.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sanctions</p> <p>Sanctions are applied for the purpose of improving teaching and learning, not for punishing schools or the people in them. Intervention from the state is not meant to be a permanent solution to unacceptable student achievement, but a way to help local schools improve student performance. It is expected that individual schools and districts will monitor their own progress and take corrective steps to improve student achievement prior to intervention from the state.</p> <p>School Improvement</p> <p>The State Board of Education in concurrence with current federal legislation will establish a system of school and school district performance based on student results from the mandated assessment system. The Board will establish a level of performance from which each school and school district in the state will be compared. Also, the Board will establish a series of expected annual increments to be known as “adequate yearly progress.” Adequate yearly progress will be established by determining the gap between the established starting point and 100% proficient and distributing the gap over a period of 12 years. Schools and school districts that fall below the established starting point and fail to make expected progress will be subject to sanctions.</p> <p>When a school or school district falls below the initial starting point or in subsequent years is below the expected performance level for two consecutive years that school or school district is identified in school improvement</p> <p style="text-align: center;">School Improvement Status</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="649 1759 1469 1791"> <tr> <td data-bbox="649 1759 1055 1791">Time Line</td><td data-bbox="1055 1759 1469 1791">Required Status and Action</td></tr> </table>	Time Line	Required Status and Action
Time Line	Required Status and Action		

Critical Element	SEA Response					
	First year a school's performance is below AYP starting point or first year a school or school district fails to make adequate yearly progress	Alert Status – Review school improvement plan and establish professional development needs for faculty and staff ³				
	Second consecutive year of a school's failure to make AYP.	School Improvement Status – School must provide choice option for students to attend another school in the district not in improvement. May, at the option of the school/district offer supplemental services if choice is not an option.				
	Third consecutive year of a school's failure to make AYP	School Improvement Status – School must continue to provide choice and add the option of supplemental services to students who qualify.				
	Fourth consecutive year of a school's failure to make AYP	School enters corrective action status – The State is required to establish and implement a plan of corrective action				
	Fifth consecutive year of a school's failure to make AYP.	Reconstruction status – the State is required to act to restructure the identified school.				
<p style="text-align: center;">School District Improvement Status</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Timeline</th> <th>Required Status and Action</th> </tr> <tr> <td>First year a school district fails to make Adequate Yearly Progress and subsequent years</td> <td>Each year the school district fails to make adequate yearly progress, the district, in addition to any schools in the district that fail to make progress, must develop a district improvement plan that will include in depth disaggregation of student performance data, the development of a district improvement plan, and development of a professional development plan specifically aligned with the identified needs of the entire district staff.</td> </tr> </table> <p>Academic Distress</p> <p>Beginning with the 2002-03 school year, the State Board of Education shall declare any school district in “academic distress” for which 75% or more of its students score at the “below basic” performance level collectively across all grade levels for which criterion-referenced assessments are administered and across all schools in the district.</p>			Timeline	Required Status and Action	First year a school district fails to make Adequate Yearly Progress and subsequent years	Each year the school district fails to make adequate yearly progress, the district, in addition to any schools in the district that fail to make progress, must develop a district improvement plan that will include in depth disaggregation of student performance data, the development of a district improvement plan, and development of a professional development plan specifically aligned with the identified needs of the entire district staff.
Timeline	Required Status and Action					
First year a school district fails to make Adequate Yearly Progress and subsequent years	Each year the school district fails to make adequate yearly progress, the district, in addition to any schools in the district that fail to make progress, must develop a district improvement plan that will include in depth disaggregation of student performance data, the development of a district improvement plan, and development of a professional development plan specifically aligned with the identified needs of the entire district staff.					

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>Any public school district classified as in “academic distress” shall have no more than two (2) consecutive school years from the date of notice of identification by the ADE to be removed from academic distress status. If the district fails to be removed from academic distress status within the two (2) consecutive year time period, the State Board of Education shall annex, consolidate or reconstitute that district prior to July 1 of the next school year unless the State Board of Education finds that the school district could not remove itself from academic distress due to circumstances beyond its control.</p>
<p>2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?</p>	<p>ACTAAP requires that all students attending the State’s public schools be included in the Accountability System. The reader should refer to the response for Section 1.1 that identifies public schools in the state including Charter Schools; special purpose schools such as the Arkansas School for the Blind, Arkansas School for the Deaf and the Arkansas School for Mathematics and Sciences; and describes pairing of schools not having a tested grade with those schools to which students attend – known as “feeder schools.”</p> <p>In addition to the regular assessments, the State provides two types of alternate assessment for students who are unable to complete those regular assessments: (1) an alternate portfolio assessment for students with disabilities and (2) an alternate portfolio assessment for students that cannot communicate in English (ELL).</p>
<p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for the identifying students in AYP decisions?</p>	<p>For the purpose of identifying students to participate in AYP decisions at the school level, a “full academic year” means that a student has been in continuous enrollment at a school from October 1 of the school year through and including the initial date of testing.</p> <p>Using the state’s data information system, each school is required to establish enrollment information of each student enrolled as of October 1 of each school year. Student mobility – drops and adds to the enrollment – is tracked in that schools enter dates of enrollment and drops for each student. The SEA will establish a required enrollment date for which schools will confirm student enrollment and from which ORME can validate that a student meets the continuous enrollment criteria.</p> <p>Students who were enrolled in one school in a district on or before October 1 of a school year and transfer to another school within the same district will not be counted toward either school’s AYP calculations, but will be included in the LEA calculations.</p> <p>Students who move from one district in the State to another district in the State and are not in any school continuously between October 1 and the test week will not be counted toward the AYP determination for either (any) of the district(s) attended. However, those students will be tracked by ORME and their progress monitored at the SEA level.</p>
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>Student attendance is tracked by the State’s electronic data management system. On October 1 of each school year, each school identifies to the student management system enrollment data, which includes identification numbers for all students attending that school.</p> <p>(Also see the response to section 2.2.)</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>Although not in place at this time, the SEA will establish policy requiring that all schools provide a list of students attending the school at the beginning of the test week. The data information system will then identify any student(s) that do not meet the continuous enrollment criteria for determining AYP at that school.</p> <p>The SEA will forward to ORME the list of students who meet the “full year” criteria for each school. ORME will then calculate AYP for each school based on the eligible students.</p> <p>Students enrolled in the system who change from one school to another school in the same LEA will be compiled to establish an overall AYP for the LEA. Students who move from one LEA to another LEA within the state will be compiled and their scores used to determine an AYP at the State level.</p> <p>In all cases each student enrolled in a school having a tested grade will be expected to complete the assessment within the administration guidelines as established by the SEA.</p> <p>Should the enrollment of a student be interrupted for temporary medical reasons or for disciplinary actions, that student will be expected to maintain contact with the school and if that student is present at the time of testing, he/she will be required to complete the test and the scores will be included in the school's AYP determination. Should a student's enrollment be interrupted for medical or disciplinary reasons – but not permanently withdrawn, and that student is not available to complete the assessment, he/she will be counted as enrolled, but not tested and will be counted against the 5% variance allowed for not completing the assessment.</p>
<p>3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State's accountability system, ACTAAP, as revised in Act 1467 of 2003, establishes 2001-2002 as the initial year for tracking student performance under this revised system and requires that all students be proficient in mathematics and reading/language arts by 2013-2014. The revisions required the State to add additional grades tested, The SEA and the State Board of Education are pursuing amendments to the State's accountability rules and regulations. Those are subject to review under the Arkansas Administrative Procedures Act and should be complete on or before August 15, 2003.</p> <p>The SEA established a definition and timeline for AYP that will require all students to perform at the proficient or advanced level by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. That definition is based on student performance in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p> <p>The SEA proposes to utilize a “three-year” model to determine AYP so that for each school the percent proficient will be determined by dividing the sum of all eligible students tested who scored at or above proficient at each tested grade for each of three consecutive years by the total number of students enrolled for each of the three years. For example a school with grades K-6 would establish its initial percent proficient by determining the number proficient on the Grade 4 Benchmark adding that to the number proficient on the Grade 6 Benchmark for each of three consecutive years beginning with 99-00, 00-01, and 01-02. The percent proficient will be determined by dividing the total number of eligible</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>students into the total number who performed at proficient or above. Each year the oldest data will be dropped and the new scores will be added.</p> <p>A public discussion of the AYP definition proposal was held on January 21, 2003. That session was attended by the Committee of Practitioners, representatives of school administrators, teachers and parent advisory groups. That group strongly endorsed the three-year model and supports the combining of grades and years to improve the stability of student scores.</p> <p>In keeping with federal guidelines, SEA policy will utilize the 20% rule to establish a starting point for determining AYP. That determination will establish the proficiency level based on a linear, sequential ranking of the enrollment data of the state's schools. From that starting point, yearly growth will be determined that will result in all students meeting proficiency by the 2013-2014 school year. The model to establish the plateaus is currently being developed by ORME and will be formally presented to the State Board of Education for adoption.</p>
3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?	<p>The SEA proposes to use a similar model to that described in 3.1 to each of the identified subgroups for which there is a sufficiently large number of students within that subgroup to meet the "n" factor.</p> <p>Reporting for each school will focus on the total population and each identifiable subgroup within that school.</p>
3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress:	<p>Across the 310 school districts in Arkansas there are 49 different configurations of grades that make up the 1150 schools. Careful analysis of these grade-level groupings, based on those that are most common and those that contain the largest number of students, the State opts to use the following grade groupings from which to frame Adequate Yearly Progress determinations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ K – 5 ▪ 6 – 8 ▪ 9 – 12 <p>Further these groupings were determined based on the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These are among the most common school configurations that have middle-level grades. ▪ These are the configurations that have the most number of students enrolled ▪ This grouping responds to the increasing number of schools that have a middle-level configuration. <p>The SEA working with ORME has calculated and validated a starting point and adequate yearly progress goals for each of the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-5 Literacy – 31.8 percent proficient • K-5 Mathematics – 28.2 percent proficient • 6-8 Literacy – 18.1 percent proficient • 6-8 Mathematics – 15.3 percent proficient • 9-12 Literacy – 19.0 percent proficient • 9-12 Mathematics – 10.4 percent proficient <p>A data table supporting the "starting point" for each cell in the AYP matrix along with the AYP calculation within each category is attached.</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>These starting points were determined using process described in 3.1.</p> <p>The 9-12 mathematics data will be developed by combining performance scores from end-of-course tests in Algebra I and Geometry. Algebra I is traditionally a Grade 9 course and Geometry is traditionally taken by students in Grade 10. AYP will be determined by comparing the number of students proficient or advanced with the number who attempted the test over the past three consecutive years from which a percent proficient is calculated. The process described in 3.1 is used to set the starting point and determine adequate yearly progress.</p>
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>The SEA proposes to establish the starting point for mathematics and reading/language arts as described in 3.2a. This will be the starting point for the total group (ALL) and each subgroup beginning with 2001-2002 as the baseline year. Twelve equal increments will be established that will ultimately lead each school and each subgroup within that school to 100% proficiency by the 2013-2014 school year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-5 Literacy – 5.68 • K-5 Mathematics – 5.98 • 6-8 Literacy – 6.83 • 6-8 Math – 7.06 • 9-12 Literacy – 6.75 • 9-12 Math – 7.47 <p>Should a school make its expected AYP for any given year, but one or more of its subgroups fail to do so, the SEA proposes a "safe harbor" test be applied to each subgroup that failed to make AYP. The safe harbor test would consider a subgroup to have met AYP if at least 10% of the eligible members of the subgroup were moved to proficient even though the total group failed to make the expected annual gain. Such determination would also be conditional to the subgroup meeting the 95% participation and other academic indicator requirements.</p> <p>The reader may refer to the attachment that provides a complete plan for all students reaching proficiency by 2013-2014.</p>
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	Arkansas will establish 12 equal incremental annual objectives/goals, thus intermediate goals are not needed.
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	In keeping with the process described in Section 3 above, the SEA will determine AYP for each school, LEA and the State on an annual basis. Reporting to schools and publishing of the annual report card will continue on an annual basis. These determinations will include the composite population (all) and each of the disaggregated groups as described in Section 5.1.
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	<p>The SEA has established the following subgroups to be included in the annual AYP process in addition to all eligible students (combined population):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Economically Disadvantaged ▪ Racial/Ethnic ▪ Students with Disabilities ▪ LEP Students

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>Within the Racial/Ethnic subgroup the following major racial groups will be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Caucasian ▪ African American ▪ Hispanic <p>The data from the Home Language Survey suggests that the number of Asian students in Arkansas schools is so small that upon disaggregation the number of data elements would not be sufficient to meet the established $n=25$ for AYP purposes. Also, the number of Native American students is so small that this subgroup will not meet reporting criteria nor criteria for accountability purposes. Therefore Arkansas opts not to include Asian as a separate subgroup for disaggregation.</p>
<p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>Using the State's student information system and the statistical reporting capabilities of ORME, the SEA is able to capture and report on each cell within the AYP matrix. The SEA will report to schools and districts the AYP determinations as soon as possible following the completion and validation of scoring of tests.</p> <p>Under the Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) each school in the state develops a comprehensive school improvement plan. That plan also is the school's application for all federal programs administered by the SEA under NCLB. That plan must include activities based on the schools greatest needs, which would include the performance of student subgroups if they did not meet the criterion for AYP.</p> <p>Each year as the SEA determines school performance; performance levels will be tracked for each cell in the AYP matrix.</p>
<p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>SEA policy dictates that all students with disabilities must participate in the assessment system and in ACTAAP. Depending of the student's IEP, testing accommodations may be allowed or an alternate assessment may be administered. In either case a student's assessment is scored and that score becomes part of the total assessment for the school and for any appropriate subgroup.</p> <p>The Alternate Portfolio Assessment System for students with disabilities provides an opportunity for students with severe disabilities to be included in the state assessment system. Instead of taking traditional paper and pencil tests, which are inappropriate for this population of students, the portfolio allows the performance of students with disabilities to be evaluated on tasks related to the content standards but leveled with the student's performance limitations.</p> <p>This portfolio system assesses student learning over time; encourages authentic, challenging tasks for students with disabilities; allows instructors and students to determine which work samples to include in the portfolio; requires linkage of student work to the Arkansas Content Standards; and promotes improvement of educational opportunities for students with disabilities.</p> <p>The portfolios are scored by outside evaluators. Each is assessed on its own merits according to a rigid scoring rubric. There are presently five (5) functioning levels in the scoring system. These are rated as: Independent;</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>Functional Independence; Supported Independence; Emergent; and Not Evident.</p> <p>The Independent level is assigned as the highest level of scoring. Students at this level demonstrate performance well beyond the Functional Independence Level. They demonstrate mastery of authentic, age-appropriate and challenging tasks in multiple settings. They can apply established literacy or mathematics skills to real world situations on their own. They can generalize learned skills to solve new challenges. Achievement scored at the Independent level on an alternate portfolio assessment for students with severe disabilities is representative of a proficient on the regular assessment.</p> <p>Representatives from the Special Education Unit serve on all teams that work on the scoring, reporting and AYP determination component. Continuing advice from those specialists inform the SEA and LEAs as necessary to assure full compliance with the inclusion of students with disabilities.</p> <p>Arkansas proposes to adopt pending guidance that will allow up to 1% of students with disabilities who participate in the alternate assessment to use the rating of Independent as being proficient on the regular assessment. Ratings of Functional Independence and Supported Independence will equate to basic and Emergent and Not Evident will equate to below basic.</p>
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>SEA policy dictates that all students with limited English proficiency must participate in the assessment system and in ACTAAP. Depending on the student's language proficiency, testing accommodations may be allowed or an alternate assessment may be administered. (The LEP alternate assessment portfolio is fully aligned with the State's Content Standards and Frameworks.) In either case a student's assessment is scored and that score becomes part of the total assessment for the school and for any appropriate subgroup.</p> <p>SEA staff who specialize in education of ESL students serve and advise on the scoring, reporting and AYP determination component. Continuing advice from such specialists inform the SEA and LEAs as necessary to assure full compliance with the inclusion of students for which English is not their primary language.</p> <p>Arkansas is an English-only state, which means that assessments are provided only in English; however, accommodations are available.</p>
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	<p>For reporting purposes, the SEA has established a minimum number of 10 students per reporting unit as the lower bound. This provided protection of the individual identity for students included in a subgroup.</p> <p>For accountability purposes, the SEA proposes that a minimum of 25 data points be available within any subgroup before that subgroup's AYP is determined independently. The 25 data points would be determined as described in Section 3 above looking across the tested grades in a school and over the three years. The SEA is assured that no school, even those with very small enrollments, will be eliminated for accountability purposes by the requirement to have 25 data elements when calculations are made</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response
	for the total population (ALL). There will be subgroups across the grade spans that will not be reported due to 25 requirement.
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	<p>The SEA is foremost concerned with the protection of the individual privacy of all students in the ACTAAP system. Section 5.5 above notes that subgroups of fewer than 10 members are not reported, and it is proposed that subgroups with fewer than 25 data elements not be considered for accountability purposes.</p> <p>Additionally, student tracking in the student information system is by assigned ID number, not student name.</p>
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	<p>Four independent factors ultimately contribute to a school's AYP progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student assessment in mathematics and reading/language arts ▪ 95% of all eligible students participation in the academic assessments ▪ At least one additional indicator ▪ Safe Harbor provision for subgroups <p>Academic Assessments</p> <p>The accountability components and the assessment system will begin with the 2001-2002 school year. Initially, assessments are in place in the content areas of mathematics and reading/language arts in the following grades: Grade 4, Grade 6, Grade 8 and in the content areas of Algebra I, Geometry and Literacy at the high school.</p> <p>Additional Grades</p> <p>Assessments are under construction in mathematics and reading/language arts for Grade 3, Grade 5 and Grade 7. Test items for those assessments will be field tested during the 2003-2004 school year with the first regular administration in 2004-2005. At that time proficiency levels will be established following the established policy. Student scores at those additional grades will be reported for the first time in August 2005 and additions to the AYP determination will be made.</p> <p>Testing in Science</p> <p>Committees will form during the 2003-2004 school year to begin the development of an assessment in science. It is projected that three grade levels will be developed initially – one for primary, one for middle, and an end-of-course test in biology to be administered Grade 10 or whenever a student successfully completes that course.</p> <p>The first regular administration of the test will be in the spring of school year 2005-2006. At that time the full assessment system as currently planned will be operational.</p> <p>Following the full implementation of the science assessment, amendments to the AYP definition will be needed to include science in the overall matrix.</p> <p>A school's placement will be determined completely by academic performance for the total enrollment and the enrollment of each subgroup. Should the total enrollment make the expected gain, but one or more of the subgroups fail to do so, the "safe harbor" test will be applied to those subgroups. If the safe harbor test holds, then the academic requirement will be satisfied. Additionally, a school will not be considered to have made AYP for any given year if the 95% participation rate is not documented and</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	<p data-bbox="586 222 1312 254">if the school cannot document progress on the other indicator.</p> <p data-bbox="586 254 1468 407">The computation of graduation rate is a four-year model that tracks student enrollment by cohort groups, beginning with a ninth grade cohort and following their progress through Grade 12. Students who drop out and subsequently complete the GED program are counted as a drop out and are not counted as a high school graduate.</p> <p data-bbox="586 499 1219 531">Graduation Rate (also known as Completion Rate)</p> <p data-bbox="586 531 1468 621">The graduation rate is used to track the progress of the same cohort of students as they enter the ninth grade and graduate four years later. The data elements for this calculation are accumulated over a four-year period</p> <p data-bbox="643 636 1435 758">Step 1: Dropout rates for each affected grade for each year are calculated first. The dropout rate is found by dividing the number of students who dropped out of that grade by October 1 enrollment for that grade.</p> <p data-bbox="634 772 1446 863">Step 2: Completion rates for each affected grade for each year are calculated. This rate is found by subtracting the grade's dropout rate from one (1).</p> <p data-bbox="634 877 1414 940">Step 3: Completion rates for each of the four grades are multiplied together.</p> <p data-bbox="634 955 1227 987">Step 4: The results in Step 3 are multiplied by 100.</p> <p data-bbox="586 1001 829 1033">Sample Calculation</p> <p data-bbox="586 1050 1458 1081">Step 1: Calculate dropout rates for each affected grade for each year.</p> <ul data-bbox="683 1096 1458 1724" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="683 1096 1458 1205">Assume number of dropouts for 95-96 9th graders is 1 and that the Oct 1, 1995 enrollment is 56. 95-96 9th grade dropout rate is $1/56 = .0179$ <li data-bbox="683 1234 1458 1358">Assume number of dropouts for 96-97 10th graders is 2 and that Oct 1, 1996 enrollment is 60. 96-97 10th grade dropout rate is $2/60 = .0333$ <li data-bbox="683 1396 1458 1554">Assume number of dropouts for 97-98 11th graders is 4 [Dec dropout report] and that the Oct 1, 1997 enrollment is 54. [APSCN cycle 2]. 97-98 11th grade dropout rate is $4/54 = .0741$ <li data-bbox="683 1583 1458 1724">Assume number of dropouts for 98-99 12th graders is 3 [APSCN cycle 4] and that the Oct 1, 1998 enrollment is 57. [APSCN cycle 2] 98-99 12th grade dropout rate is $3/57 = .0526$ <p data-bbox="586 1738 1162 1770">Step 2: Calculate each year's completion rate.</p> <p data-bbox="683 1785 980 1816">95-96: $(1 - .0179) = .9821$</p> <p data-bbox="683 1816 980 1848">96-97: $(1 - .0333) = .9667$</p> <p data-bbox="683 1848 980 1877">97-98: $(1 - .0741) = .9259$</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response																														
	<p>98-99: $(1 - .0526) = .9474$</p> <p>Step 3: Multiply all completion rates together.</p> <p>$(.9821)(.9667)(.9259)(.9474) = .8328$</p> <p>Step 4: Multiply the results in Step 3 by 100.</p> <p>$(.8328)(100) = 83.3\%$ graduation rate</p> <p>The reader is referred to the attachment for a full definition along with an example of the model applied. Also the reader may refer to the ADE Website where all definitions of the Report Card are maintained.</p> <p>http://www.as-is.org/reportcard/calculations.html#attend</p> <p>The mean graduation rate for the state is 85.1 percent.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="586 758 1141 1339"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Graduation Rate</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Mean</td><td>86.74167</td></tr> <tr><td>Standard Error</td><td>0.54649</td></tr> <tr><td>Median</td><td>88.4</td></tr> <tr><td>Mode</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>Standard Deviation</td><td>9.652942</td></tr> <tr><td>Sample Variance</td><td>93.17929</td></tr> <tr><td>Kurtosis</td><td>4.501843</td></tr> <tr><td>Skewness</td><td>-1.52748</td></tr> <tr><td>Range</td><td>64.2</td></tr> <tr><td>Minimum</td><td>35.8</td></tr> <tr><td>Maximum</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>Sum</td><td>27063.4</td></tr> <tr><td>Count</td><td>312</td></tr> <tr><td>Confidence Level(95.0%)</td><td>1.075285</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The above statistics for 2001-2002 indicate that the standard deviation for these data is 9.65. Schools for which the graduation rate is more than one standard deviation below the mean will not meet adequate yearly progress and thus would not be allowed to invoke the safe harbor provision for subgroups</p>	Graduation Rate		Mean	86.74167	Standard Error	0.54649	Median	88.4	Mode	100	Standard Deviation	9.652942	Sample Variance	93.17929	Kurtosis	4.501843	Skewness	-1.52748	Range	64.2	Minimum	35.8	Maximum	100	Sum	27063.4	Count	312	Confidence Level(95.0%)	1.075285
Graduation Rate																															
Mean	86.74167																														
Standard Error	0.54649																														
Median	88.4																														
Mode	100																														
Standard Deviation	9.652942																														
Sample Variance	93.17929																														
Kurtosis	4.501843																														
Skewness	-1.52748																														
Range	64.2																														
Minimum	35.8																														
Maximum	100																														
Sum	27063.4																														
Count	312																														
Confidence Level(95.0%)	1.075285																														
7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	<p>The additional indicator for both elementary and middle schools is percentage of attendance. This percent is calculated by dividing the three-quarter average daily attendance (ADA) by the three-quarter average daily membership (ADM). [APSCN cycle 7]</p> <p>Data for this indicator are collected for each school by the student information system and aggregated and reported as part of the State report card.</p> <p>The mean attendance rate for the state is 92.7.</p>																														

Critical Element	SEA Response																												
	<p data-bbox="586 226 1305 258">http://www.as-is.org/reportcard/calculations.html#attend</p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="699 300 899 331" style="text-align: center;">Attendance Rate</p> <hr/> <table data-bbox="586 373 1008 867"> <tr><td>Mean</td><td>93.00769</td></tr> <tr><td>Standard Error</td><td>0.094368</td></tr> <tr><td>Median</td><td>92.85</td></tr> <tr><td>Mode</td><td>93.4</td></tr> <tr><td>Standard Deviation</td><td>1.666872</td></tr> <tr><td>Sample Variance</td><td>2.778462</td></tr> <tr><td>Kurtosis</td><td>2.976071</td></tr> <tr><td>Skewness</td><td>1.044288</td></tr> <tr><td>Range</td><td>11.5</td></tr> <tr><td>Minimum</td><td>88.5</td></tr> <tr><td>Maximum</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>Sum</td><td>29018.4</td></tr> <tr><td>Count</td><td>312</td></tr> <tr><td>Confidence Level(95.0%)</td><td>0.18568</td></tr> </table> <p data-bbox="586 909 1442 1077">The above statistics for 2001-2002 indicate that the standard deviation for these data is 1.66. Schools for which the attendance rate is more than one standard deviation below the mean will not meet adequate yearly progress and thus would not be allowed to invoke the safe harbor provision for subgroups.</p>	Mean	93.00769	Standard Error	0.094368	Median	92.85	Mode	93.4	Standard Deviation	1.666872	Sample Variance	2.778462	Kurtosis	2.976071	Skewness	1.044288	Range	11.5	Minimum	88.5	Maximum	100	Sum	29018.4	Count	312	Confidence Level(95.0%)	0.18568
Mean	93.00769																												
Standard Error	0.094368																												
Median	92.85																												
Mode	93.4																												
Standard Deviation	1.666872																												
Sample Variance	2.778462																												
Kurtosis	2.976071																												
Skewness	1.044288																												
Range	11.5																												
Minimum	88.5																												
Maximum	100																												
Sum	29018.4																												
Count	312																												
Confidence Level(95.0%)	0.18568																												
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	<p data-bbox="586 1140 1409 1192">The State's academic indicators are valid and reliable for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="634 1199 1463 1377">▪ The assessment system is constructed based on the Content Standards. Independent contractors utilize proven test construction practices in the design, scoring, scaling and reporting. An independent technical advisory committee of experts with documented assessment and psychometric training observe and advise. <li data-bbox="634 1383 1455 1623">▪ The other academic indicators are research-based in that attendance is a proven factor that is linked to student performance. Additionally, the SEA process for collecting and tabulating attendance data is consistent across schools/LEAs and are reported as part of the SEA report card. These data are collected through the student information system on a regular and periodic basis throughout the year. The data are assimilated, validated and made available for reporting purposes. 																												
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	<p data-bbox="586 1633 1451 1749">The state does measure performance in mathematics and reading/language arts independently for the purpose of determining AYP. Such calculations are made for the total population and for each identified subgroup independently.</p>																												
9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?	<p data-bbox="586 1791 1463 1875">SEA efforts to make the data more stable and increase the reliability of data are linked to the use of the rolling average – combining three years of data along with linking across the tested grades in the school.</p>																												

Critical Element	SEA Response
	<p>The SEA also believes the option of the “safe harbor” provision for subgroups may further enhance the overall reliability of the AYP determination.</p> <p>The proposed methodology for calculating and reporting AYP is new and will be observed, monitored and adjusted as warranted. Reliability is best established in such a system when it performs well over time. The SEA assures that it will monitor the results on a continuing basis for data or trends that seem inconsistent.</p> <p>The Office of Research Measurement and Evaluation at the University of Arkansas will also exercise its own reliability checks on data as it works with the SEA and schools in providing continuing professional development.</p>
9.2 What is the State’s process for making valid AYP determinations?	<p>The SEA has established the following system of review and appeal should a school or LEA believe the sanctions or determination of AYP is errant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The school/LEA reports contested AYP determination to the Assistant Director for School Improvement and Professional Development. ▪ The Assistant Director, with assistance from an appeals panel, reviews the appeal and responds to the school/LEA. ▪ Should this determination warrant further appeal on the part of the school/LEA, a formal letter of appeal is made to the Chief State School Officer. The Chief may review, seek advice from ORME and the appeal’s panel, and make a determination. ▪ The school/LEA may make final appeal to the State Board of Education, whose decision is final.
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	<p>The response to Section 6.1 describes the developmental process and proposed inclusion of additional assessments into the AYP system.</p>
10.1 What is the State’s method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	<p>Each school in the state is bound to test 100% of the students enrolled at the time State tests area administered. Students will take either the regular test, the regular test with accommodations, or the alternate assessment for students with disabilities or the alternate assessment for students determined to have limited English proficiency. The State’s student information system will be used to determine participation rates. It has been determined that a student must be enrolled in a school on October 1 of the school year for which an assessment is used to determine AYP for that school. Also, each student eligible for consideration in the AYP determination must have been in continuous enrollment for the “school year” or at least until the week that tests are administered. To make these eligibility determinations, the SEA will devise a system to begin in 2003-2004 that will require each school to track and report students continuously enrolled and make that determination in the student record. The details of that tracking will be determined prior to the administration of the test in the spring of 2004. This tracking system will be managed through the State Data Information System. This procedure will be used to determine the number of students that must be accounted for in each school.</p> <p>Students whose continuous enrollment may be disrupted due to disciplinary action such as short-term expulsion or assignment to an alternative school site for a prescribed period of time will be tested and</p>

Critical Element	SEA Response
	those scores will be used in the AYP determination for the school of record.
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	<p>Once tests are administered, a comparison will be made as to the number of completed tests, including the number who took the regular test with accommodations and the number completing the alternate portfolio assessment, in relation to the number enrollment at the school on the day the tests are administered. The SEA will determine the percent of students completing the tests to determine if that percentage is equal to or greater than 95%.</p> <p>It is the State's policy that schools in which the percentage tested falls below the 95% level may not invoke the safe harbor provision as applied to subgroups.</p>

Calculating AYP Starting Points and Adequate Yearly Progress						
	K - 5 Literacy	K - 5 Math	6 - 8 Literacy	6 - 8 Math	9 - 12 Literacy	9 - 12 Math
Starting Point 01-02	31.8	28.2	18.1	15.3	19	10.4
AYP	5.68	5.98	6.83	7.06	6.75	7.47
Year 1: 02-03	37.48	34.18	24.93	22.36	25.75	17.87
Year 2: 03-04	43.16	40.16	31.76	29.42	32.5	25.34
Year 3: 04-05	48.84	46.14	38.59	36.48	39.25	32.81
Year 4: 05-06	54.52	52.12	45.42	43.54	46	40.28
Year 5: 06-07	60.2	58.1	52.25	50.6	52.75	47.75
Year 6: 07-08	65.88	64.08	59.08	57.66	59.5	55.22
Year 7: 08-09	71.56	70.06	65.91	64.72	66.25	62.69
Year 8: 09-10	77.24	76.04	72.74	71.78	73	70.16
Year 9: 10-11	82.92	82.02	79.57	78.84	79.75	77.63
Year 10: 11-12	88.6	88	86.4	85.9	86.5	85.1
Year 11: 12-13	94.28	93.98	93.23	92.96	93.25	92.57
Year 12: 13-14	99.96	99.96	100.06	100.02	100	100.04